



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission
Sunnyside in Sevier Park

METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION SUMMARY MEETING MINUTES

August 19, 2015

Commissioners Present: Chairman Brian Tibbs, Rose Cantrell, Sam Champion, Richard Fletcher, Aaron Kaalberg, Ben Mosley

Zoning Staff: Melissa Baldock, Paul Hoffman, Robin Zeigler (historic zoning administrator), Susan Jones (city attorney)

Applicants: Mark Wick, Barrett Hobbs, Nancy Jones and Kirk West, Dereck Hoevel, Thomas Brett, Mitch Hodge, Macario Lacap

Public: Barrett Hobbs

Chairman Tibbs called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m. and read aloud the process for appealing the decisions of the Metro Historic Zoning Commission and the time limits on presentations.

I. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. July 15, 2015

Motion:

Commissioner Cantrell moved to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner Champion seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

III. OVERLAY RECOMMENDATIONS

b. None

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC: Items on the Consent Agenda will be voted on at a single time. No individual public hearing will be held, nor will the Commission debate these items unless a member of the audience or the Commission requests that the item be removed from the Consent Agenda.

a. 613 17th AVE NORTH

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 19

Overlay: Historic Landmark Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID #: 2062568

b. 1329 SIXTH AVE NORTH

Application: Signage

Council District: 19

Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 2061979

c. 751 BENTON AVE

Application: New construction-outbuilding
Council District: 17
Overlay: Woodland in Waverly Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN
Permit ID #: 2061795

d. 1207 SHELBY AVE

Application: New construction-detached accessory dwelling unit; setback determination
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 2061804

e. 221 SCOTT AVE

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 2061950

f. 4210 ELKINS AVE

Application: New construction-addition and outbuilding; Setback determination
Council District: 24
Overlay: Park and Elkins Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 2061952

g. 128 WINDSOR DR

Application: New construction-additions and outbuilding; Setback determination
Council District: 23
Overlay: Belle Meade Links Triangle Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 2061957

h. 255 CHEROKEE RD

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 24
Overlay: Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 2061971

i. 1423 STRATTON AVE

Application: New construction-detached accessory dwelling unit; Setback determination
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 2061977

j. 1618 17TH AVE S

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 17
Overlay: South Music Row Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 2061988

Chairman Tibbs explained that the consent agenda items would be approved with one motion unless an item was requested for removal. Staff member Sean Alexander listed the consent items, noting that 1329 6th Avenue North was administratively approved and 1618 17th Ave S was moved to “MHZC Actions” at the request of the staff. There were no other requests to remove an item from the consent agenda.

Motion:

Commissioner Champion moved to approve the consent agenda items with their applicable conditions, with the exception of 1329 6th Avenue North and 1618 17th Avenue South. Commissioner Fletcher seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

V. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED ITEMS

The items below were deferred from a previous MHZC meeting at the request of the applicant.

None

VI. MHZC ACTIONS

j. 1618 17TH AVE S

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 17

Overlay: South Music Row Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 2061988

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for an addition to 1618 17th Avenue South. The applicant proposes to enlarge the existing two-story house with a three-level addition which would include parking in a partially excavated basement.

The addition will be set in on both sides with a narrow hyphen connection between its primary mass and the historic building, while the mass of the addition will sit two feet in from the sides of the original building.

The roof ridge will be nearly two feet taller than the existing, with eaves and a foundation line three feet higher than their existing counterparts.

The addition includes basement level parking. This is a common feature where the natural grade at the rear is significantly lower, however, here it would only be possible by excavating the back yard. This proposed addition makes it effectively a split-level that puts three stories behind the historic two-story house. Staff finds that scale is not appropriate for an addition.

Staff recommends disapproval of the proposed addition at 1618 17th Avenue South, finding the scale to not be subordinate to the historic two-story house, and that the proposal would not meet sections II.B.1.b, II.B.1.c, II.B.2.d, II.B.2.e, and II.B.2.h of the South Music Row Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines.

Mark Wick with RootArch handed out drawings including 3-D models to show the addition. The view from the street will match what is there by keeping similar cornice lines.

Commissioner Mosley arrived at 2:17pm.

Commissioner Fletcher expressed concern about the additional height being so much more than what they have approved in the past and with the attached parking level not being fully at the basement level.

In answer to Chairman Tibbs question, the difference in grade between existing building and the rear addition is about 3.5’.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Cantrell stated her concern about the massing on this corner with the addition and with the previously approved new building and said that all of it together doesn't match the rhythm of the street.

Commissioner Champion asked if they have ever allowed additions to be taller. Mr. Alexander stated that the overall height might be consistent with what has been approved, if you just consider ridge height, but in this case the floor levels and foundation level are also taller. The parking area is not fully at the basement level, as has been required in the past. Commissioner Champion noted that additions should be subordinate to the historic building.

Commissioner Kaalberg said it was really a creative solution but to have split levels, different cornice heights and the addition being larger all together does not meet the design guidelines IIB.2 b and c.

Motion:

Commissioner Champion moved to disapprove finding the project does not meet section II.B.2 b and c. Commissioner Cantrell seconded. Commissioner Mosley abstained since he did not arrive in time for the entire presentation. The motion passed with four votes in favor.

k. 306 BROADWAY

Application: Signage

Council District: 19

Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 2061984

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for a sign at 306 Broadway. The sign will be on a pilaster in the second story wall. It will be 14' 4" tall and project 7' from the face of the building including one foot of separation from the wall. The cabinet will be 18" wide, and will be made of aluminum with exposed neon lighting on the letters and graphics. Although the location and materials, and lighting of the sign are appropriate, the size of the sign and distance that it projects from the building are greater than the design guidelines allow. 306 Broadway is 28 feet wide at the front. Under the Broadway Design Guidelines they are allotted 2 square feet for each linear foot of street frontage, or 56 square feet (per side). The proposed sign would be 75 square feet (per side). Signs are permitted to project up to 6 feet from the face of a building, including the 1' of separation from the wall, but the proposed sign would project 7 feet.

Staff recommends approval of a projecting sign at 306 Broadway with the conditions that:

- The sign be reduced to the maximum allocated by the design guidelines, fifty-six square feet (56 s.f.) or less; and
- The sign project no more than six feet (6') from the face of the building including a one foot (1') minimum separation from the façade.

Staff recommends approval with all conditions and disapproval without all conditions. Meeting those conditions, Staff finds that the proposed signage would meet the design guidelines for the Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

Barrett Hobbs, applicant, asked for a compromise to the design guidelines. He provided some history to the building, businesses in the building, and the alterations to signage code. Economically speaking, the business is at a disadvantage because signs placed prior to the current regulations are larger than what the code allows. He is chairman of the Downtown District and been a contributing member to the organization for six years. His handout showed what they originally proposed, their proposed compromise and what would meet the code. He said what will meet the code is not worth doing. He expressed concern about the expansion of the downtown overlay; he is a business guy who pays a lot of taxes; and the more he can make out of the building the more he can restore it. The guidelines have changed but not the ownership so its not fair to place new regulations on him. He and MHZC staff figured out how large it had to be in order for a tourist to see it from 4th Avenue and they determined that the one proposed would meet that requirement.

Commissioner Fletcher said that he hoped Mr. Hobbs could understand their position that they have design guidelines that they need to follow and if they allow one to do it, they have to allow others to do it.

Mr. Joslin provided a history of the previous sign code and the development of the current code. He suggested that the code should change. The Mayor loves neon and that is what Broadway is.

Commissioner Champion stated that he also sits on the district board and lives downtown and he understands the concerns of the merchants. He remembered that even when the Ryman came before them, they held them to the guidelines.

Commissioner Kaalberg asked Staff how the guidelines compare to the rest of the DTC and Ms. Zeigler stated that they were exactly the same. Commissioner Kaalberg agreed with Mr. Champion that they needed to stick to the design guidelines in order to be fair to other merchants.

Motion:

Commissioner Champion moved to approve with the conditions that:

- **The sign be reduced to the maximum allocated by the design guidelines, fifty-six square feet (56 s.f.) or less and,**
- **the sign project no more than six feet (6') from the face of the building including a one foot (1') minimum separation from the façade.**

Commissioner Cantrell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

I. 128 SECOND AVE

Application: Violation

Council District: 19

Overlay: Second Avenue Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID#: 2062328

Staff member Robin Zeigler presented the case for 128 Second Ave N. This is a request to retain work that was done that is either different than what was permitted or not permitted. The applicant received a permit for alterations on December 11, 2014, a rooftop addition on January 9, 2015, and signage on Feb 5, 2015.

The first alteration is a change to the storefront window that was not appropriate. The design guidelines require that replacement windows look similar to the historic windows, which in this case were steel industrial windows; however, that type of design isn't really conducive to the uses prevalent on Second Avenue as it doesn't give a clear storefront for a commercial display or to see into a restaurant. NANA walls were used which have been approved in the past when the historic storefront was no longer there, and the window is similar to one approved in 1996. Staff finds the alteration to meet section II.A.3.

The recessed entrances were replaced with a narrow dry-stack stone veneer and a textured material. Replacing the previous material is appropriate since the original no longer exists. Section II.A for general principles of street level facades states that the use of contemporary materials are only appropriate if they possess characteristics similar in scale, design finish, texture, durability, and detailing to historic materials. The narrow dry-stack stone and textured wall used in the entrances does not replicate historic stone. In addition, the stone design is one typically seen on much later buildings than those found in this district.

Because the stone does not meet the design guidelines, Staff recommends disapproval and that it be replaced with another material that is approved administratively. Brick to match the existing brick, wood or smooth-faced cement fiber panels would be appropriate substitutes.

The First Avenue façade had a roll-up door on the second floor (1st level from Second Avenue). Roll-up doors are not appropriate on principle facades in the historic district; however, since the building already had existing doors, the applicant was advised they could keep them, as shown on the plans they submitted in December.

The applicant has replaced them with new roll-up doors that have changed the dimensions of the previous opening. Roll-up doors do not meet section III. H as they do not replicate the original windows nor are they similar to windows found on this style and period of building. Because the alteration does not meet section III.H of the design guidelines. Staff recommends disapproval of this alteration and that the the roll-up doors be replaced with windows that meet the design guidelines.

One option is to reestablish the punched, arched, window openings that were there originally. A second option would be to restablish the previous opening, as it lined up with the windows above, and replace the roll up doors with windows that meet the design of industrial windows seen on multiple buildings on the First Avenue side and seen originally on the historic Second Avenue façade of this building. This is the same treatment that was recommended in 1996 when a previous owner proposed to change the windows.

The design guidelines require that roof top additions sit back from the First Avenue façade by at least ten feet (10'), which was what the applicant originally proposed. The original drawings submitted by the applicant show the rooftop bar being a minimum of fourteen feet and seven inches (14' 7") from the First Avenue façade but the bar is now only seven feet (7) from the First Avenue facade. A portion of the bar is covered and the portion closest to the First Avenue façade is not. In the past, the Commission has approved railings that are eight feet (8') from the front wall of a building. (The railing in this instance was an existing railing.) Since the bar is uncovered and not much taller than a railing, its width is minimal and its encroachment into the setback area is minimal, staff recommends approval.

A small wall sign (48 sq ft) and banner sign (dimension unknown) were added to the front façade. (See figures 3 and 10). The Second Avenue side of the building is allotted ninety-nine and one-half square feet (99.5 sq ft) since there is a projecting sign. The existing marquee sign, originally approved under different design guidelines in 1997, includes two signs that together are approximately 120 square feet. The existing signage on the Second Avenue side exceeds the sign allotment of the current design guidelines; therefore staff recommends disapproval of the addition of the wall and banner signs.

Staff recommends approval of the storefront window and the intrusion of the rooftop into the setback area, finding the alterations to meet the design guidelines. Staff recommends disapproval of the wall sign on Second Avenue and the replacement of the second level window on First Avenue, finding the alterations do not meet sections III.H., III.F, II.B.

Kirk West, speaking for Ms. Jones, showed a picture of the existing roll-up door to show the the size of the opening has not changed. They said they could remove the "GJ" and the banner sign added to the front. They could not match the brick when deciding what material to use in the recessed entrances so they matched the dry stack stone from a wall on Granny White Avenue that the Mayor liked.

Mr. Hobbs said he was part of the district task force that had to handle the former occupants of this building. Nashville is at a crossroads and they have worked hard to make sure that Second Avenue does not get left in the rearview mirror. Prior to beginning this project, they met with Mayor Dean to look at property taxes, which have dropped on Second Avenue. There has been no economic growth on Second Avenue prior to this project.

There were no other requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Champion said that since they didn't change the size of the opening and just updated a fixture there is no cause to activate the design guidelines. Later in the meeting, Commissioner Champion stated that he was confused and thought the opening had not changed. Commissioner Mosley countered that in looking at the photographs, it definitely had changed. Commissioner Kaalberg said that a better result could have been accomplished if they had just called staff.

Commissioner Mosley said it was clear to him in the images that were passed around there has been some change to the opening and that if you take the roll-up door out of the conversation and any applicant were to come in and ask to change the window opening size, that would be a big deal in this particular district. The sill runs all the way across and you can see that the opening is not the width of the sill any longer. It may not seem like a big deal, but he thought it was a pretty big deal.

Mr. Mosley suspected that the wood infill that was removed by the current owner was put in place by a previous owner to make a standard garage door work in that space.

Mr. West was invited back to speak and stated that there is a steel column behind where the wood used to be. Commissioner Champion asked if they had worked with staff on solutions. Mr. West said he spoke with Ms. Zeigler once and was advised to replace the door with windows. He said his architect claimed to know what he was doing and so he thought it would be alright. After the new door came in, they had never talked to historic about adding new brick.

Commissioner Kaalberg initially stated that it was appropriate to replace the door which didn't meet the design guidelines, with a new door that also didn't meet the design guidelines. After lengthy discussion, Mr. Kaalberg acknowledged that a replacement must meet the design guidelines, providing the example that if a house were covered in vinyl siding, an owner removed the siding, they would not be allowed to put vinyl siding back up again.

Susan Jones, attorney, explained that typically when items are legally non-conforming, they are protected because they have been previously approved and those are the type of uses that the code tries to protect. In this case, we are not talking about the code but it is a similar situation in that the roll-up door was not approved by the Commission previously.

Commissioner Cantrell asked legal counsel if there was something that doesn't conform and it is replaced, if it must then meet the code. Ms. Jones said yes and Commissioner Cantrell then stated that this was her concern with allowing for the door, as well as the brick, that was not permitted.

Commissioner Fletcher stated that if the concern is setting a precedent, there is no precedent set here since they are replacing a door rather than allowing for a new door. Commissioner Champion agreed, but after further discussion agreed that since they replacing the door, the code and design guidelines must be applied.

Commissioner Mosley explained that consistency and not being arbitrary is their job, but its less about the past and more about what the design guidelines say. Their decision must be in keeping with the design guidelines. Ms. Zeigler read the design guidelines which state, "If repairs are needed it should use historically appropriate materials and methods. Replacements to façades should be in keeping with the historic character of the building."

Commissioner Kaalberg recommended that the applicant defer and work with staff on a solution since the violation is a result of work being done with no consultation with staff.

Commissioner Mosley noted that the stone is not in keeping with how true stone would look and when using an applied stone it should look more like real stone. He was not aware that stack stone exists in a recessed opening. What you would see is larger pieces of a hammered limestone or something that would be applied. The proposed stone is more typical of a residential building.

Commissioner Champion moved to approve per staff recommendation. The motion died without a second.

Mr. West asked the Commission to defer. Ms. Jones encouraged the Commission to come down and see it for themselves. She said she had spoken to Ms. Zeigler, but she didn't see anything wrong with changing the door on First Avenue. She agreed to remove the banner and the GJ sign.

m. 110 SECOND AVE

Application: Alteration: Window Replacement

Council District: 19

Overlay: Second Avenue Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID#: 2062330

Item was removed from the agenda as drawings were not received by deadline.

n. 109 EVANDER ST

Application: Violation

Council District: 6

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID#: 2062550

Item was removed from agenda as drawings were not received by the deadline.

o. 1719 5TH AVE N

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 19

Overlay: Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

Permit ID #: 2061798

Staff member Paul Hoffman presented the case for an addition at 1719 5th Avenue North, a contributing building in Salemtown. The Commission had disapproved the owner's request to keep unpermitted work in March of 2014. The applicant is proposing an addition to be done, along with correcting the previous work. The proposed additional footprint is approximately the same size as the current footprint of the house.

Staff found that this is a situation where the side addition is appropriate as the historic house itself is very narrow, and is also off-center on the lot. The new addition will actually not be as wide as the current addition there, although it will be taller.

The left side of the addition is drawn with a full second story. Staff's interpretation was that this part should be more of a dormer than a second story, which is the reason for our conditions 2 and 3 in the staff recommendation. The owner and the designer met with Staff yesterday, and have asked to keep this design, both for its construction and for the living space.

The applicant was asked to provide a design that just had roof facing the street, and they have done that.

One of Staff's conditions was that the front door opening remain as it is currently. The applicant says that the previous door opening is framed taller than this, so if that is the case Staff would find that returning the opening to its original dimensions would be appropriate.

Commissioner Fletcher asked how the project was different from a previous addition that was taller than the historic building. Ms. Zeigler explained that this was a one-story building in Salemtown compared to a two-story building in South Music Row. In Salemtown, the historic buildings are very small, but there is a great deal of new construction that includes large, two-story buildings; therefore, larger additions have been approved here that might not be appropriate in other districts.

Derek Hoevel stated that his understanding of the difference between the two is also that the garage will be fully at the basement level and the other was a split level.

Staff member, Mr. Hoffman, encouraged the applicant to explain why he did not wish to meet the conditions of the staff recommendation.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Kaalberg said it is a substantial addition but the floor levels are consistent, the existing building is a small one-story home, there is a grade change that allows for a garage fully at the basement level and there is a great deal of large construction surrounding it so he found it to meet the design guidelines.

Motion:

Commission Kaalberg moved to approve with the conditions that:

- **The foundation height of the addition maintain the existing foundation height;**
- **The side dormers be redesigned to set back at least two feet (2') from the wall beneath and two feet (2'") from the gable;**

- The dormer on the south elevation have its roof pitch increased, to reduce the visible wall area;
- The front door opening remain the same dimensions, unless evidence exists that it was a larger opening historically;
- Lap siding will have a reveal no greater than five inches (5");
- Staff provide final approval of all materials, including windows & doors.

Commissioner Cantrell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

p. 319 S 17TH ST

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

Permit ID #: 2061806

Staff member Paul Hoffman presented 319 South 17th Street, an application for a new addition to an existing rear addition. Staff has requested that the applicant reduce the overall height and eave height of the new construction, and he has met that condition, so Staff recommends approval of the project with the condition of approval of windows and doors.

The applicant was present but declined to speak. There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the conditions:

- The addition's overall height and eave height not be taller than the ridge and eaves of the existing historic building;
- Staff approve the windows prior to purchase and installation.

With these conditions, Staff finds that the project meets the design guidelines for the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Commissioner Kaalberg seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

q. 3516 RICHLAND AVE

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 24

Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 2061965

Staff member Sean Alexander presented the application for constructing a rear addition to an historic house. The applicant proposes to enlarge the house with a rear addition that includes a basement level, rear-facing garage.

The walls of the addition will be set in from the original building with alcoves on both sides, sitting in 1' and extending about 5' back. The addition then steps back out to match the width of the house, and it will also be deeper front to back than the original building.

The roof will tie into the existing roof, matching the ridge and flush with the side slopes of the original hip roof. The eaves of the addition will also match the eave height of the existing house.

By matching the width of the house, being longer front to back than the house, and by not stepping in from the of the roof, staff finds that the addition is not subordinate to the historic building, and would have a negative an impact on its form and integrity.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed addition with the conditions that:

- The roof is stepped in from existing roof's side slopes and down from the ridge, and,
- the addition steps in from both sides of the existing house without stepping back out; and/or,
- the depth of the addition is reduced to be less than that of the historic house,

- the selections of windows and doors are approved by Staff prior to installation and purchase.

Meeting those conditions, Staff finds that the proposed addition would meet the design guidelines for the Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Thomas Brett asked that the plans be approved based on precedent found in the neighborhood and he handed out photographs of other projects and explained the projects.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Champion stated his concern about the depth of the addition and that the roof should be subordinate.

Commissioner Mosley said that if you continue the roof face from the hip you do not separate the new from the old. All things together, the massing is too large. It should be done in a way that if it were removed, you are preserving the original house and the current roof proposal doesn't accomplish that. The applicants examples do show that and are a better fit to the design guidelines.

Commissioner Cantrell stated that the bump-in is a must and she agrees with staff recommendation.

Motion:

Commissioner Champion moved to approve with the conditions that:

- **The roof is stepped in from existing roof's side slopes and down from the ridge,**
- **the addition is stepped in from both sides of the existing house without stepping back out; or**
- **the depth of the addition reduce to be less than that of the historic house,**
- **The selections of windows and doors are approved by Staff prior to installation and purchase.**

Commissioner Cantrell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

r. 210 SOUTH 10TH STREET

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID #: 2061916

Staff member Robin Zeigler presented the case for new construction-infill at 210 South 10th St. The applicant proposes to construct eight (8) units as townhomes and single-family homes at the corner of South Tenth and Russell Streets. The project requires rezoning to a Specific Plan (SP). The MHZC approved the preliminary plan on June 17, 2015 and Metro Council has approved the SP.

Setbacks and rhythm of spacing, height, building and roof shapes were all reviewed by the MHZC as part of the preliminary proposal. The current proposal reflects the decision of the MHZC regarding those specific design guidelines, including all conditions, with the exception of the height of unit 1, and some minor alterations to roof forms which are explained.

The project meets the design guidelines in terms of orientation, proportion and rhythm of openings, the known materials and appurtenances.

There are slight changes from the approved preliminary plan for the roof shapes. Units 4 and 5 were proposed to have flat roofs and now have a side-gable roof on the South 10th Street side and unit 3 has a side-gable roof form for a portion of the building that faces Russell Street, rather than flat roofs as originally planned. Either form is appropriate; however, the side-gable form helps to minimize the massing and so is considered an improvement.

The proposal meets all the height requirements of the preliminary plan, with the exception of the rear portion of Unit One. For the preliminary review, Staff recommended and the Commission agreed that the rear portion should be no more than one and one-half stories to mitigate the additional massing as seen from the street and the impact the additional massing would have on the lot to the right. The rear portion was originally planned as a garage on the ground floor and living space on the second floor. Because of grade constraints, lowering the height of the rear

portion enough to meet the one and one-half requirement would mean moving the garage entrance to the right side of the primary massing of the house. The entrance off the side alley will be awkward and the garage doors highly visible on Russell Street.

The current proposal is similar to the preliminary proposal; however, the roof form has been changed from a flat roof to a hipped roof which helps to minimize its massing. In addition, this portion of the house sits back thirty feet (30') from the front wall of the house. Staff recommends approval of the proposal with the full two stories, finding that scenario to have less of an impact on the neighborhood than a side garage in the main massing of the house and because alterations have been made to its roof form, minimizing its massing.

Mitch Hodge noted that they have worked with staff.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve with the conditions that:

- **Staff approve final materials such as masonry, windows and doors, trim and porch materials and roof color;**
- **New drawings be submitted prior to permitting that show a greater level of design detail; and,**
- **HVAC be located on the rear façade, on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house or, in some cases, on the roof.**

Commissioner Champion seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

s. t. and u. 100, 101 and 117 RANSOM AVENUE

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 18

Overlay: Elmington Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 2062509

Melissa Baldock presented the applications for three infill houses in the Ransom Avenue development in the Elmington Place Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. The houses under consideration are Lots 1, 5, and 6 (101, 117, and 100 Ransom Avenue). To date, the Commission has approved the design of seven of the eleven houses that are part of the development.

Lot 6, 100 Ransom Avenue has a right side façade that faces Byron Avenue. The Commission has determined that the houses that have side facades facing Byron and Richardson Avenues should address both Ransom Avenue and the side streets. These houses should have two "front" facades so that they appear to have orientation towards both Ransom Avenue and the side streets. Staff finds that the wrap-around porch for Lot 6 is a significant architectural feature on the Bryon Avenue/side street façade and gives it the appearance of a primary façade. In addition, the house's roof form and fenestration pattern are compatible with the front façade look of this façade. The house's height, width, scale, roof form, and materials are all compatible with what the Commission has approved in the past in the Ransom development. Staff finds that the design of Lot 6 meets the design guidelines and recommends approval of it with the standard conditions regarding the staff's final approval of the finished floor height, all materials, and the placement of HVAC units.

Lot 5, 117 Ransom Avenue, is located toward Richardson Avenue, but is over 60 feet from the street. In between the street and the house on Lot 5 is required open space for the development. The side façade addresses Richardson Avenue with a wrap-around porch and a secondary entrance. Because this façade is located behind the open space and over 60' from the street, its side façade does not need to appear like a front elevation as do the other corner lot properties. Staff finds its orientation to meet the design guidelines. The house's height, width, scale, roof form, and materials are all compatible with what the Commission has approved in the past at the Ransom development. Staff finds that the design of Lot 5 meets the design guidelines and recommends approval of it with the standard conditions regarding the staff's final approval of the finished floor height, all materials, and the placement of HVAC units.

Lot 1, 101 Ransom Avenue's left side façade faces Byron Avenue. Therefore, it should have a Byron Avenue façade that looks like a front façade. However, staff finds that the Byron Avenue façade does not adequately address the side street. This façade should appear as a primary façade with a primary entry. Staff finds that the wrap-around porch does not adequately read as a primary entry. In addition, the two porches on this façade, separated by a central gabled bay, give the façade the appearance of a side façade rather than a primary front façade. The applicant has added a pediment to the porch roof, but staff finds that this still does not give the porch the look of a primary façade.

Staff is recommending disapproval of the design for Lot 1 because its orientation does not appropriately address Byron Avenue, does not meet Section II.B.1.f. of the design guidelines, and does not match the agreement of the developer to include two primary facades on this corner lot.

Staff is recommending disapproval rather than approval with conditions because we find that the design of the house requires significant re-working and that any design that would adequately address Byron Avenue would need to come back to the Commission for approval.

In conclusion, staff is recommending approval of Lots 5 & 6, with the following conditions:

- Staff approve the finished floor height during construction,
- Staff review and approve all final material selections,
- the shutters be fully operational,
- the siding have a maximum reveal of 5", and,
- Staff approve the location of the HVAC units.

Staff is recommending disapproval of Lot 1, finding that its orientation does not appropriate address Byron Avenue, does not meet Section II.B.1.f. of the design guidelines, and does not match the agreement of the developer to include two primary facades on corner lots.

The applicant was not present and there were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Mosley noted that if borrowing craftsman details and if the column pedestal is the same width as the post, it doesn't have appropriate detailing and he recommended that the pedestals be thicker and to be careful that there is enough room left for the stone veneer so it doesn't extend beyond the porch floor.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve infills for Lots 5 and 6 (117 and 100 Ransom Avenue), with the following conditions:

- **Staff verify the construction height of the foundation and floor systems in the field to ensure that the finished floor line of the new construction is compatible with the historic context;**
- **Staff provide final review of the windows and doors, roof color, railing design and material, brick and stone samples, and the material for the entryway and porch floors;**
- **the shutters be fully operational;**
- **all siding will have a maximum reveal of five inches (5");**
- **the HVAC units be placed on the rear façades, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the houses; and,**
- **the stone base is wider than column base at its widest point.**

Commissioner Mosley moved to disapprove construction of 101 Ransom Avenue based on the fact that the project does not meet section II.B.1.f of the design guidelines. Commissioner Cantrell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

v. 905 MANILA AVE

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 05

Overlay: Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

Permit ID #: 2061916

Paul Hoffman presented 905 Manila Avenue, the first of five proposed infill projects on recently-recorded lots that were subdivided from the historic house, Lookaway, at 909 Manila Avenue. The project meets the relevant design guidelines, but Staff has requested that window openings be added to the side elevations, and that the horizontal window toward the front of the right side be redesigned to more traditionally-proportioned window or windows instead. The applicant is agreeable to the conditions.

The applicant was present but declined to speak. There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Champion moved to approve the project with the conditions.

Staff recommends approval with the conditions:

- Window openings are added to the side elevations;
- the horizontal window on the right side is redesigned to a more traditionally-proportioned window or windows;
- the finished floor height shall be consistent with the finished floor heights of 909 Manilla, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
- Staff approve the roofing color, and final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation; and,
- the HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house; and,
- Staff approve the roof color and masonry color, dimensions and texture.

Commissioner Mosley seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Champion left at 4:52.

w. 910, 912, 914, and 916 GRANADA AVE

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 05

Overlay: Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

Permit ID #: 2061926

Mr. Hoffman presented 910, 912, 914 and 916 Granada Avenue. These are the other four new buildings in the same project as 905 Manila Avenue. These four face Granada Avenue.

The applicant has worked with Staff and these meet the design guidelines.

The context on this side of the project on Granada Avenue is non-contributing buildings, except for the bungalow down the hill from the proposed infill.

Commissioner Mosley asked about the finish of the ceilings of the second level. Mr. Lacap explained that they had not made a final decision but it would probably be bead-board.

Motion:

Commissioner Cantrell moved to approve with the conditions that:

- the finished floor height shall be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
- Staff approve the roofing color, and final details, dimensions and materials of windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;
- the HVAC shall be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house; and,
- Staff approve the roof color and masonry color, dimensions and texture.

Commissioner Fletcher seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

t. PRELIMINARY SP REVIEW

None

u. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

aa. Elect Chair and Vice-chair

Motion:

Commissioner Fletcher moved to re-appoint Chairman Tibbs as Chairman. Commissioner Kaalberg seconded and motion passed unanimously. Commissioner Kaalberg moved to re-appoint Vice-chair Nielson as Vice-chair. Commissioner Cantrell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. Administrative Permits Issued for Prior month

RATIFIED BY COMMISSION ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2015